DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 312 239 SP 031 572

AUTHOR O'Loughlin, Michael
TITLE Reconceptualizing Educational Psychology To Facilitate Teacher Empowerment and Critical Reflection.
PUB DATE Oct 88
NOTE 48p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Midwestern Association for Teachers of Educational Psychology (Bloomington, IN, October, 1988).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Critical Thinking; *Discussion (Teaching Technique); *Educational Psychology; Higher Education; *Intellectual Development; Preservice Teacher Education; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Education Programs; *Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

This paper discusses teaching psychological foundations courses to undergraduate preservice teachers. It is argued that the current approach to pedagogy in this area is ineffective because it does not take account of the fact that most prospective teachers, after years of acting as participant observers of the acts of teaching and learning, have implicit and limiting assumptions about the nature of teaching and learning. There is considerable evidence to suggest that the way courses such as educational psychology typically are taught actually serves to reinforce and confirm the narrow, unexamined and often mythical assumptions preservice students hold. The primary focus of this paper is on a critical pedagogy that is developmentally appropriate, provides optimal facilitation of further cognitive and epistemological development, and that takes as its starting point preservice teachers' existing conceptions of knowing, learning and teaching. Among the instructional techniques used in this form of pedagogy are class participation, journal writing, formal writing for a variety of audiences, and the extensive use of large and small group discussions. Syllabi of several courses in educational psychology are appended. (JD)

Reconceptualizing Educational Psychology to Facilitate Teacher Empowerment and Critical Reflection*

Michael O'Loughlin

Bowling Green State University**

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Midwestern Association for Teachers of Educational Psychology, Bloomington, Indiana, October 1988.

* Comments welcome and appreciated!

** Please address correspondence prior to December 20, 1988 to Michael O'Loughlin, Department of Educational Foundations and Inquiry, Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, Ohio 43403. After December 20, 1988, my affiliation will be: Department of Curriculum and Teaching, Hofstra University, Hempstead, New York 11550.

My purpose in this paper is to challenge the conventional wisdom with respect to how we educate teachers. Although I believe that what I have to say may have broad application in teacher education, I will confine my remarks here to the specific topic of teaching psychological foundations courses, notably educational psychology, to undergraduate preservice teachers. The thrust of my argument will be that our current approach to pedagogy in this area is ill-conceived and ineffective because it does not take account of some important psychological realities that must be reckoned with in teaching young adults about a topic as familiar as the nature of teaching and learning. The major problem, I will argue below, is that after more than a dozen years in school, acting as participant observers of the acts of teaching and learning, prospective teachers come to our classes with well-worked out, implicit and limiting assumptions about the nature of teaching and learning. Instead of taking on the challenge of helping students confront these beliefs, examine them critically, and then go on to develop more epistemologically sophisticated conceptions of teaching and learning, there is considerable evidence to suggest that the way we typically teach courses such as educational psychology, actually serves to reinforce and confirm the narrow, unexamined and often mythical assumptions our students hold.

The argument I will present here is based on the critical educational writings of Paolo Freire and has its theoretical psychological roots in constructivist theories of adult intellectual development, notably the work of William Perry (1968) and his followers. Since I have written elsewhere (O'Loughlin, 1988a,b) on the psychological

and philosophical foundations of my position, the primary focus in this paper will be on outlining the kind of critical pedagogy that I have been experimenting with as a method of facilitating the development of critical awareness and sophisticated concepts of epistemology and pedagogy among the student teachers with whom I work.

The Issue: Teachers' Beliefs

Although the issue of teachers' beliefs and their effects has been discussed from a variety of perspectives in the literature (e.g., Clark, 1988; O'Loughlin & Campbell, 1988), Deborah Britzman (1986) presents the issue in its sharpest focus. Britzman begins her argument by pointing out the obvious yet frequently ignored fact that by the time student teachers reach our classes they have already accumulated a rich set of cultural beliefs and myths about teaching and learning in their institutional biographies. The problem, as Britzman's data nicely illustrates, is that due to the pervasiveness of the traditional didactic teaching method in school, as well as the fact that students only see the products of teaching (e.g., lectures, homework) rather than the process, students usually develop a very simplistic understanding of the nature of epistemology and pedagogy. Much of what students typically believe could be summed up by saying that they subscribe to the received view of knowledge. This view, which, as Jackson (1986) notes, has been in dialectical tension with a constructivist or transformative view of knowledge at least since the time of Aristotle, argues that all knowledge is objective and reducible to facts; that knowledge emanates from authorities or experts who can be relied upon to provide "the right answer"; that teaching is the transmission of knowledge from expert to novice and

consequently that learning is the acquisition of objective knowledge; and that knowledge is a possession whose presence in all students, in the same form, can be assessed by means of standardized tests. Britzman's data suggest that in student teachers this epistemological position is typically accompanied by a conception of teaching as an authoritarian activity, a view that causes students to have a constant preoccupation with issues of classroom control and management. The end result - and surely our own experience speaks to the truth of this - is that student teachers tend to have a very set image of teaching as telling and controlling, and of learning as absorbing and conforming. Thus, our students typically do not come to our classes to broaden their epistemological horizons - at best they come expecting to receive an arsenal of recipes and handy hints to help them accomplish what they already know to be the purpose of teaching. The problem, of course, is that unless we, in teacher education, find ways to help our students to examine their beliefs and assumptions, there is a strong likelihood that they will become unreflective teachers who will maintain the status quo in our educational system. Britzman sums up the problem this way:

> I argue that the underlying values which coalesce in one's institutional biography, if unexamined, propel the cultural reproduction of authoritarian teaching practices and naturalize the contexts which generate such a cycle (1986, p. 443).

The Real Problem: Teacher Education

If you accept this analysis it becomes of interest to consider the extent to which teacher education promotes the kind of reflective thinking and critical consciousness that would lead students to examine their institutional biographies and then to go on to develop

enriched epistemological and pedagogical theories. The issue is particularly pertinent to faculty who teach psychological foundations since, at heart, the issue of interest here is a psychological one. Regrettably, the news from teacher education is not good. Although there have been advocates of a reflective approach to teacher education at least since the time of Dewey, the evidence from a wide variety of sources (e.g., Britzman, 1986; Goodlad, 1983a,b; Kliebard, 1975; Zeichner, 1983) suggests that faculty in colleges of education usually teach in a traditional didactic manner, suggesting that they subscribe to the same received view of knowledge which our students have come to hold through their experience of schooling.

In teacher education the received view of knowledge is manifested in the predominantly behavioristic orientation of the field; in the dependence on prescriptive textbooks which frequently reduce teaching to a simple set of discrete problems with ready solutions; in the predominance of traditional didactic methods such as lectures, multiple-choice tests and mastery of information; and in the underlying belief that a set of scientifically validated generic teaching skills exists and can be successfully imparted so that beginning teachers acquire the expertise to become proficient, and to teach in "the right way." All of these methods, however, serve to confirm and reinforce students' authoritarian conceptions of teaching and their subscription to the received view of knowledge. Furthermore, they serve to reinforce students in their quest for the best method of teaching - "the one right way" that will equip them with enviable technical skill and expertise. John Goodlad recently summed up the inadequacies of contemporary teacher education as follows:

> Professional education is intended to immerse the neophyte in the state of the art and science of teaching and simultaneously to separate him or her from the myths and anachronisms of conventional practice. Teacher education appears to be organized and conducted to assure precisely the opposite (1983b, p. 468, emphasis added).

All of this would only be academic, of course, if there were widespread satisfaction with the quality of our public schools, and thus with the performance of the teachers we graduate. Unfortunately, however, public schools have been under sustained attack for almost a decade. Now, while some of the reform agenda can perhaps be dismissed as ideologically laden, and while structural factors also need to be considered in school change (cf., McNeil, 1986), nonetheless, the plight of schools should give teacher educators pause. Research (e.g. Goodlad, 1983a,b; Sizer, 1984) has documented the lack of cognitive engagement, and the prevailing sense of alienation and detachment that characterizes the atmosphere of so many of our public schools, institutions which, not incidentally focus most of their energy on promoting authoritarian control and traditional didactic methods of teaching. Sirotnik (1983), summing up the findings from his and Goodlad's research, captured the essence of the problem, when he concluded that the hidden curriculum of the school teaches "dependence on authority, linear thinking, social apathy and hands-off learning" (p. 29). Schools have also been assailed (e.g., Ravitch & Finn, 1987) for their failure to transmit basic factual information to students. There are some who worry that the lack of cognitive engagement and critical thinking in schools actually poses a threat to the continuance of a participatory democracy in this country (e.g., Finkelstein, 1984; Giroux & McLaren, 1986; Greene, 1988).

Teacher education, inevitably, has come in for criticism too. This is hardly surprising when one considers that 40% of new teachers abandon the profession within two years of graduation (Rand study, cited in Ryan, 1987). One solution to the problem - and this one has been adopted by the State of Ohio - is to recommend that two teachers should be trained for every vacancy to compensate for attrition. This is surely an expensive way of avoiding addressing the problem of educational reform. Others, notably the State of New Jersey, have begun to question the merits of any teacher education whatsoever. How can we defend our work? How can teachers of educational psychology defend their work when research shows that most students forget most, if not all, of what they "learned" in educational psychology classes shortly after graduation?[1] Can we afford to ignore these data? I suggest that it is time for us to re-examine our own beliefs about knowledge, teaching and learning so that we may begin to seek alternative solutions to the challenge of educating teachers.

A Constructivist Basis for Pedagogy

An alternative to the view that all knowledge is given is to be found in the view that knowledge is socially constructed through the individual's effort after meaning and striving for understanding. This constructivist notion is central to the scheme of intellectual development presented by William Perry (1968) as a result of his analysis of the patterns of intellectual development among Harvard undergraduates. Perry's interest was in how students construed their world, and in how this construal or understanding changed over their four years of college education. Perry's concept of intellectual development in adulthood is that it represents an "epistemological

pilgrim's progress" (p. 44), with growth in the individual's means of understanding or "ways of knowing" being the principal index of intellectual development.

As a result of his analysis, Perry proffered a developmental scheme which suggested that development involves gradual movement from simple dualism through notions of absolute relativism to, in the end, a form of contextual relativism in which people are sensitive to the need to consider a plurality of alternatives, to weigh relevant evidence, and to come to conclusions that balance these with their own personal beliefs and values in a process Perry refers to as "commitment." Of particular interest here is Perry's description of those students who were classified as largely dualistic in their outlook. Perry found that some of the freshmen he interviewed had strong tendencies toward dualism. They preferred to view the world in simple black-and-white terms; they believed that right answers existed for all questions and that truth emanated from authorities or experts; and they viewed the process of schooling as one of conforming obediently to authority and of accumulating the knowledge dispensed by authorities. The parallel between this description and the kind of thinking that Britzman's (1986) data revealed as characteristic of student teachers is quite striking. The significance, of course, is in the developmental implications. If Perry's scheme is correct, then, rather than being at the end point of epistemological and cognitive development, most of our students are only at the starting point when we meet them. Perry's research suggests that the progression from dualism through to contextual relativism is not a simple linear pathway, but rather, a painful progression of false starts,

temporizing, regression, and fitful progress as individuals gradually begin to broaden their epistemological horizons and consider the world in a more complex way. Both Perry and others (e.g., Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger & Tarule, 1986) suggest that the type of teaching to which students are exposed can be a critical factor in either facilitating or retarding the development of more sophisticated ways of knowing.

While the developmental and pedagogical implications of Perry's work are well known and widely used as the basis for constructivist approaches to pedagogy in the fields of adult and professional education (e.g., Daloz, 1986; Perry, 1981), the positivistic orientation of conventional teacher education, of which educational psychology is a prototypical example, appears to have precluded any serious examination of a constructivist alternative to the traditional prescriptive approach. With the crisis we are currently facing, however, the time may now be ripe for considering a constructivist alternative.

A Critical Pedagogy for Teacher Educators

Accepting for now the validity of the constructivist position, how can we take advantage of this view to invent a pedagogy that is developmentally appropriate, that provides optimal facilitation of further cognitive and epistemological development, and that takes as its starting point preservice teachers' existing conceptions of knowing, learning and teaching? I have spent the past two years grappling with this issue, both through my own informal experiments with various pedagogical techniques, and through searching the theoretical literature on critical pedagogy and reflective teaching for an appropriate theoretical model of teaching. Of all of the

formulations that I have studied, the model that seems to fit most comfortably with my own evolving practice of pedagogy is the notion of critical pedagogy originally articulated by Paulo Freire (1972) in Pedagogy of the Oppressed, and since elaborated both by Freire (1985) and his followers (e.g., see Shor, 1987; Shor & Freire, 1987). My thinking about pedagogy has also been influenced by the notions of "voice' and "connected teaching" advanced by Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger and Tarule (1986).

My position is explicitly constructivist. I believe that students construct knowledge through their own attempts at making sense out of the world, and that common understanding emerges from the shared communication of ideas. Freire nicely sums up the essence of constructivism as the understanding and reinvention of ideas by learners:

> Knowing, whatever its level, is not the act by which a Subject transformed into an object docilely and passively accepts the contents other give or impose on him or her. Knowledge, on the contrary, necessitates the curious presence of Subjects confronted with the world. It requires their transforming action on reality. It demands a constant searching. It implies invention and reinvention. . . . In the learning process the only person who really learns is s/he who appropriates what is learned, who apprehends and thereby reinvents that learning; s/he who is able to apply the appropriate learning to concrete existential situations. On the other hand, the person who is filled by another with "content" whose meaning s/he is not aware of, which contradicts his or her way of being in the world, cannot learn because s/he is not challenged (Freire, 1973, p. 101, quoted in Elsasser & John-Steiner, 1987, p. 50 - emphasis added).

To facilitate this kind of learning, Freireans would argue that a learning environment must be created that is problem-posing, dialogical and empowering for students.

First, with respect to problem posing, if indeed understanding develops through active inquiry rather than passive absorption, it follows that students will engage in more searching if they are presented with problems that do not have obvious solutions, but rather, which challenge the students and the teacher to engage in dialogue in order to explore the elements of the problem and to examine possible solutions. As Frankenstein (1987) says, "Freirean problem-posing is intended to reveal the interconnections and complexities of real-life situations where 'often problems are not solved, only a better understanding of their nature may be possible'" (p. 188, including quote from Connolly 1981, p. 73). Posing real-life problems offers a number of significant advantages to teacher educators. In the first place it immediately confronts the students with the complexity and plurality of the real world - a painful but sure-fire way to cause them to question the "one-right-way" belief that underlies the received view of knowledge. Second, it gives the teacher the opportunity to situate the learning both in the students' own existential experiences, by causing them to reflect on the problematics associated with how they were and are being educated, and it allows opportunity for the learners to consider educational problems, as well they should, in their historical, political, social and cultural contexts. Finally, by posing educational dilemmas the teacher gains the opportunity to challenge students to confront their institutional biographies - their taken-for-granted notions of teaching, learning and knowledge - by raising questions which, in Maxine Greene's (1988) term, "defamiliarize" the commonplace.

Integral to a problem posing approach to education is the need for active participation by all learners in the making of meaning and the act of coming to know and understand. Essential to this is the creation of a dialogical atmosphere in which teacher and students are co-investigators, working together to develop the best possible solution to problems to which no easy answers are available. As the data in Belenky et al. (1986) show, this kind of learning cannot take place in a classroom in which the teacher already knows the answer, since the teacher's omniscience will discourage students from developing their own, inevitably tentative, interpretations. To have genuine inquiry, genuine problems must be addressed. While participation and dialogue are essential, it is important to note, too, that the dialogue must be designed so as to promote critical reflection and examination of assumptions. Jesse Goodman's (1984) data illustrate how easy it is to have discussion and information sharing in a classroom without ever providing an opportunity for students to engage in critical examination of their own or others' views through a process of genuine dialogue.

In the dialogical classroom the ideal learning sequence, according to Freireans - and note here the remarkable similarity with Perry's scheme - begins by helping students articulate their existing beliefs with respect to the problem under discussion. Freireans refer to this as a process of naming one's existential experience - a process analogous to the feminist notion of facilitating the development of voice (Belenky et al., 1986). No authentic learning can take place absent the voice of the learner. Until people can first name their experience, and feel the authenticity of their own views, they can

hardly be expected to go beyond this to consider their view in relation to alternate viewpoints. Naming of experience can occur through classroom dialogues, and quite usefully, especially for novices to this type of learning, through the use of journals. The next step is to create a comfortable dialogical environment in which students can share their existential experiences with others. This process of sharing gives students confidence in the authenticity of their experience and allows them to expand their epistemological horizons by engaging the views of others. Once this type of process is well under way the instructor takes on the role of problem-posing, of presenting multiple perspectives on a given problem (e.g., through assigned readings, viewing of films, etc.), and of challenging students to begin to consider the multiple dimensions of the problem, and particularly the contextual (e.g., epistemological, social, cultural and political) assumptions that underlie suggested solutions. As Elsasser and John-Steiner (1987) note, drawing usefully on Vygotsky's ideas, at this point the teacher's role becomes one of increasingly <u>decontextualizing</u> the issues - separating the individual from his or her own world view - to induce increased metacognitive and critical reflection. The ultimate goal of this process is to have students arrive at the stage which Belenky et al. (1986) term "constructed knowing," in which each individual is encouraged to integrate the disparate voices and viewpoints that have emerged through discussion and reading with his or her own subjective opinion in order to develop an informed, critical, yet also subjective and personally authentic position on the issues. For student teachers,

this might usefully be termed a "philosophy of teaching," in the deepest sense.

Finally, it should be noted that for Freireans, the concept of critical reflection is closely tied to action in a process Freire refers to as praxis. The purpose of giving students an opportunity to develop their voice, of presenting problems and dilemmas situated in the context of real-word ethical, social, cultural and political situations, and of engaging in dialogue, is to help students understand problems so that they can engage in transformation or social change. This would suggest that teachers have a responsibility for engaging students in a serious questioning of the fundamental purpose of education, with a view to helping them make the distinction between education as an agent of social reproduction and education as a transformative process that empowers and liberates students so that they too can act upon the world. Freireans do not assume that education is value-free. Rather, they would argue that the ultimate goal is praxis - a process in which people, after recognizing and naming the problems to be addressed, begin to test out possible solutions with a commitment to addressing these problems in a manner that contributes to the humanization and empowerment of their students, so that they too can improve their existential situation.

In my own experience I have frequently encountered students who prefer classes that teach "one-right-way" methods of pedagogy, than classes like mine which induce dissonance and which strive to make students acutely conscious of the complexity of education embedded in a social context. Two points should be noted. First, this anxiety is perfectly normal, and according to Perry's developmental indicators,

suggests passage from simple dualism to an awareness of relativism. As Perry notes, this stage, during which students become aware of a plurality of positions, but have not yet developed an intellectual understanding of contextual relativism that would enable them to weigh differing points of view, is often quite painful for students. However, such confusion is necessary to intellectual advancement. Second, and more important, this type of problem - posing is essential to the empowerment of students. There is considerable research demonstrating that too many practising teachers either do not comprehend any possibilities for education beyond the received view of knowledge,and are thus disempowered by ignorance, or else they are disempowered through institutional constraints (Darling-Hammond, 1985; Darling-Hammond, & Wise, 1985; McNeil, 1986). If empowerment is the key to educational reform, then it is critical that we make students aware of the possibilities inherent in teaching, and give them a belief that they, too can make a difference. By providing for active student participation in the construction of meaning, by caring about students learning (cf., Noddings, 1984), and by allowing students to develop an authentic voice we begin this process of empowerment that I believe is the key to developing teachers who want to and believe that they can make a difference in schools. Elsasser & John-Steiner sum up the importance of participatory learning and voice in the process of empowerment this way:

> When people are convinced that they can share their social reality and that they are no longer isolated and powerless, they begin to participate in dialogue with a larger world, first orally and then through writing (1987, p. 51).

A Critical Pedagogy for Educational Psychology

I have three goals for my educational psychology classes. First, I want my students to experience the possibilities inherent in a constructivist approach to learning so that they may become "better knowers" who feel empowered to construct their own knowledge, and who see virtue in asking questions and posing problems rather than in the perpetual pursuit of right answers. I want them to experience the possibilities inherent in this kind of inquiry for their own growth, but, more importantly, so that they can regard education as a project of possibility in which they feel motivated to provide similar mind-expanding, authentic educational experiences for their students. In the words of Belenky et al (1986), I want them to learn "the profound lesson that even the most ordinary human being is engaged in the construction of knowledge" (p. 133).

Second, I want my students to view educational issues as complex problems embedded in social, historical, cultural and political contexts. When we discuss issues, I want them to step back from the usual "how to" questions, to understand that every methodological choice is predicated on some set of assumptions and beliefs about the contexts and purpose of education. I would like my students to be able to make informed choices about curriculum and method, based on a serious weighing of the contexts and purposes of education, and bearing in mind that many of the technical solutions that are available serve to reinforce the authoritarianism of schools at the expense of the growth potential and empowerment of the individual.

Finally, through the use of pedagogical techniques that facilitate individual voice, dialogue and collective deliberation on

educational dilemmas and existential experience, I want to leave my students with a rich understanding of the complexity of educational dilemmas, yet with sufficient understanding of the purpose of education and the underlying causes of the problems, that they feel empowered and committed to enhancing voice, motivation, intellectual inquiry and empowerment for all students.

I should note that I would like to include praxis, too, as one of my goals. Within the specific constraints of teaching a single semester course with a minimal field experience component, to more than 35 students, I cannot address this issue. I think that praxis is a crucial, yet often ignored issue in teacher education. To get students to move from thinking in interesting ways about teaching, to teaching in interesting ways, it is vital that we understand how to bridge the gap between theory and practice. As yet, this issue has been poorly addressed in the field, and I regret that I have not yet had an opportunity to address this important issue either.

You may wonder how successfully these goals can be accomplished within the constraints of a single-semester course which is expected to cover most of the topics in the typical educational psychology textbook. I believe that there are limitations to what can be accomplished in one semester, in a single course, no matter what form of pedagogy is employed, and I would certainly prefer to see students receiving fewer courses of longer duration, or else more serious attempts at integration across courses (e.g., via team teaching). Nevertheless, I believe a lot can be accomplished and I would like to share with you the approach I currently use, bearing in mind that my practice of pedagogy is constantly evolving. You may be heartened to

know, by the way, that just two years ago, when I first began teaching educational psychology, I practised a very traditional mastery-based approach. To enable you to see how much my ideas have changed I have attached the syllabus from my original course (Appendix A), as well as the syllabus from my current course (Appendix B), and part of the syllabus from an honors section of educational psychology that I have taught recently (Appendix C). The latter two syllabi, while not exhaustive, also provide a sense of the range of reading material, films and classroom assignments that I use in pursuit of my goals. Your comments and questions about these syllabi are welcome.

Problem-Posing Methodology. I do not teach my class as a discrete set of topics, nor do I introduce my class to students by giving an overview of the purposes of educational psychology. Instead, I prefer to introduce students to what, to me, is a perplexing dilemma: Why are most of our schools so didactic, authoritarian, and conformity-oriented? Why must most instruction be via lectures and worksheets? Doesn't anybody care that over 95% of all class time is devoted to teacher talk in most schools? Isn't there any room for student voice, interest and involvement in school? Why is school so homogenized that students must leave their cultural and experiential backgrounds at the gate each day? Can we pretend that our schools offer equal opportunity when we look at the dropout rates, the illiteracy rates and the statistics on learning disability and school failure in conjunction with demographic patterns of rural and urban poverty and minority residence? This problem of lack of empowerment, voice and intellectual engagement in schools, with its

many dimensions, serves as the underlying raison d'etre for my purpose in teaching educational psychology.

In terms of problem-posing, I have worked hard over the past two years to shift away from a set of discrete topics, each of which addresses a discrete problem and offers a discrete solution. Instead I have striven to articulate a number of fundamental, interrelated dilemmas which serve as an umbrella within which the traditional syllabus topics are integrated in the service of addressing the issues of voice, empowerment and involvement just raised above. Most fundamental to my approach is that all problems and issues must be addressed in terms of underlying assumptions and purpose. Whenever students want to defend a pedagogical approach, I require them to evaluate it in terms of its fundamental purpose and assumptions, rather than in terms of technical superiority. I help them distinguish means from ends and I always require them to consider ends before means when evaluating pedagogical approaches.

I have succeeded in distilling my curriculum into four fundamental dilemmas, each of which addresses the fundamental issues of voice, empowerment and intellectual engagement from four overlapping perspectives. The first dilemma begins innocently enough by posing the question of the appropriateness of extrinsic rewards as a device to assure that students do their work in school. Students, because of their own typical reward histories, their feeling that rewards "work," and the apparently ubiquitous belief that children (especially young children) cannot do anything for intrinsic reasons, usually argue in favor of extrinsic rewards. Once the issue has been raised, during the following four weeks or so, students engage the issue of

motivation on a variety of planes. First they begin by analyzing their current motivation pattern and reasons for it, and share their views with others during small-group discussion. Second, students are asked to reflect on both their motivation history and current motivation patterns, and are asked to identify the possible role which different teaching patterns and styles have played and continue to play in shaping their motivation. Next, the discussion is focused on the fundamental dilemma of motivation, namely whether to opt for an extrinsic or intrinsic approach. The topic is raised in an informal way by having students react to provocative articles on the issue from the popular press (e.g., Skreslet, 1987). Again, students share views, offer opinions and listen to other viewpoints. After this much preparation, students are usually ready to engage the issue on a more intellectual plane - to examine the research, to consider underlying psychological processes, etc., and to bring this information, too, to bear in arriving at an informal, constructed view of the issue. I usually focus the inquiry on three issues: (1) the relationship between self-worth and school achievement; (2) the theory and practice of extrinsic motivation and reinforcement theory; and (3) attributional approaches to motivation theory and the desirability of developing healthy attributions and intrinsic motivation in students. I currently use Stipek's (1988) authoritative book as a required text for this inquiry. At the end of the unit students are expected to be able to describe a desirable approach to motivation and explain why, in terms of underlying processes and assumptions this approach makes sense. In my current class, students address this issue by working in small groups to develop a detailed "problematic motivation scenario," for

which they then develop solutions. In their solutions, students are required to address what kind of underlying educational purpose is being served by the solution they propose before they begin to explain what technical changes they would want to make in the conduct of the class (e.g., analyzing the lack of voice in a silent, didactic classroom, and how it affects motivation and learning, before, for example, presenting technical suggestions on how to enhance the level of student participation).

The second dilemma with which students are confronted is the most elemental. I hold it over for a month or so, until students have become practised in dialogical and participatory learning techniques. This dilemma addresses the fundamental epistemological question of whether knowledge is received from authority or constructed by each individual. Students begin this unit by writing in their journals and dialoguing in class about the following questions: What is the nature of teaching? What is the nature of learning? What is your metaphor for teaching? What is the nature of knowledge? After initial consideration of their current and previous existential experiences of learning and being taught, students are presented formally with the behavioristic, humanistic and transformative (i.e., constructivist) approaches to teaching and learning. Readings are assigned for each one and classroom dialogue centers on (1) elucidating the steps involved in each approach; (2) listing the pros and cons of each; (3) evaluating the underlying assumptions each makes about teaching, learning and knowledge; (4) and visually diagramming the pedagogical process being described. Again, the crucial focus in our dialogue is not on choosing the best approach, but on assessing the underlying

assumptions to see which epistemology represents a socially critical and intellectually challenging goal for teaching. Since students find compromise tempting, I insist that we examine the areas of incompatibility of the underlying epistemologies of the three approaches so that students are forced to engage the dilemma of choosing between the approaches on epistemological, and then pedagogical grounds. I typically use extracts from Skinner (1968) and Jackson's (1986) final chapter to describe the behaviorist approach; extracts from Rogers (1983) and currently Fenstermacher and Soltis (1986) for the humanistic approach; and extracts from sources such as Jackson (1986), Petrie (1981) and Belenky et al. (1986) for the transformative approach.

Once students have engaged the possibility of transformative teaching on an existential, first, and then an intellectual level, the next step is to move a step toward praxis by having students consider ways of facilitating the kind of classroom dialogue that is necessary for constructed knowing to occur. This is a delicate issue which, if not handled carefully, is liable to lead students to focus on ways of introducing discussion groups in their classes that is narrow and technically, focused, rather than epistemologically grounded. To avoid this, my students and I engage in a careful study of the ideas in Douglas Barnes' (1976) valuable book From communication to curriculum. Barnes' book is particularly useful because it is explicitly constructivist; it is concrete and laden with classroom examples; and because it raises in a very challenging way the inescapable relation between the patterns of communication permitted by the teacher and the types of learning which are possible for

students. This book is very useful at helping students envisage the practice of transformative teaching.

I should add that I experiment with a wide variety of dialogical formats in class (e.g., large and small group discussion; student-supervised discussion; students teaching students, etc.), and I encourage students to view the classroom as a learning laboratory and to reflect on the effect which each kind of pedagogical environment has on their own construction of knowledge. Since my pedagogical practice has been strongly influenced by Barnes' ideas, I urge the students to assess carefully how well my approach mirrors the transformative philosophy inherent in Barnes' ideas. Since my real-life pedagogical struggles often encounter unexpected obstacles and opportunities, the experience of discussing my successes and failures in class is, I believe, invaluable in giving students insight into pedagogy as an evolving dialogue rather than a polished performance. Textbooks, no matter how well written, often unwittingly convey the latter impression.

In my class, students also are encouraged to use their journals to analyze other classes they are taking in order to try to identify the apparent purpose and likely epistemological perspectives of their different teachers. Some class time is also spent sharing metaphors of teaching, along with the strengths and limitations of the language of each. I have found metaphors very helpful to me in conceptualizing teaching, and many students appear to find it helpful too. This, the longest unit in the course, culminates with students writing a formal synthesis paper on the nature of teaching and learning, as well as a highly personal philosophy of teaching, in which they describe a

population they intend to work with, and explore in detail the assumptions about epistemology, pedagogy, and learning that will guide the practice of their teaching.

Since I use a similar approach in addressing the remaining two dilemmas, I will not describe either in great detail. The third dilemma I address with my students pertains to issues of classroom management and school discipline. The dilemma is posed to students in terms of the choice between conformity and voice, the promotion of authoritarianism versus the facilitation of self-discipline. Again, care is taken to ensure that students weigh the options, and examine the issue in term of the underlying issues having to do with power and authority, and the role of the school in facilitating or inhibiting the empowerment of individuals. It is worth noting at this point, since the discipline dilemma is prototypical in this respect, that students usually not only have strong prejudices and false beliefs with respect to these dilemmas, but also a good deal of legitimate anxiety. As long as the indicators of professional success for beginning teachers, in college field experiences as well as in their first jobs in schools, hinge upon images of authoritarianism and didacticism, it is very difficult to empower them to feel comfortable with alternate beliefs and practices of teaching, particularly within a one-semester course.

The fourth dilemma that my students address is an umbrella problem having to do with issues of equity in school. I am still working at developing my unit on cultural minorities, handicapped students, failing students, gender differences and poverty and socioeconomic factors, into a cohesive unit which poses the issues of

motivation, learning and discipline in their cultural, social, political and historical context. The syllabus (Appendix B) suggests how I currently address these issues - and my general pedagogical approach is as outlined above - but this is the point at which I feel most strongly that my course could benefit from a teach-teaching or interdisciplinary effort, to help situate these issues in their contexts. If there is any word that can accurately characterize my approach to these issues, perhaps it is the word "voice." Following the model of "connected teaching" described by Belenky et al. (1986), which my students and I study, I try to sensitize my students to consider the problem of excluded groups in our schools in terms of absence of voice. I try to help my students develop sensitivity to voice, to the need to accommodate all voices, to value and foster authentic voice, and to pose all problems initially within the existential reality of the lived experience of each of their future students, since I believe that all of these are prerequisite to dialogical and ultimately transformative pedagogy. You may judge for yourself the progress I have made in attempting to incorporate these ideas into a critical pedagogy for educational psychology.

A Footnote on Teaching Style

Since my teaching style can probably be inferred from the foregoing discussion and the attached syllabi (Appendix B & C), I will not discuss it in detail here. However, the following notes may add clarification. (1) Since the notion of voice is so fundamental to my teaching philosophy, the entire pedagogy is centered around eliciting, affirming and expanding students' voices. Class participation, journal writing and formal writing for a variety of audiences are the

primary means through which students explore voice. (2) I believe in the necessity of situating pedagogy in people's lived experience, consequently, the first means of addressing each dilemma is through students' reflection on their own existential experiences. (3) Since the students will gain only a certain amount through dialogue about their own experience alone, the possibilities for dialogue are greatly amplified by assigning carefully selected readings. However, since I do not use class time to lecture on readings, all students commit to reading the materials critically before class and maintaining a work log (which I inspect), in which they record critical reactions, questions and problems for discussion in class or for elaboration in their journals. (4) As noted earlier, the dialogical format of the class varies, with extensive use of large and small group discussions, students teaching students using reciprocal teaching methods, and students volunteering to take full responsibility for "teaching" a given session. In the latter case, any approach except lecturing is encouraged. (5) Students are given a variety of writing assignments, but each is written in multiple drafts. Students are required to gain written feedback from at least two other students (which they turn in with the final draft), and I also read rough drafts if requested. (6) As can be seen from the syllabi (Appendix B & C), the focus of the classroom is on demonstrated learning, and I am constantly experimenting with ways to structure the evaluation system to more accurately reflect genuine student learning and understanding. (7) I require regular attendance by students, since this kind of pedagogy cannot work in the absence of students, and it is practically impossible for students to make up for a dialogical session which they

have missed. (8) I have struggled with ways to integrate the required 20-hour field experience into my pedagogy, in order to address praxis, but, as yet, have been unable to figure out how to do this in a Freirean manner, within the constraints of the course structure. (9) As my pedagogy has evolved, it is worth noting, student satisfaction ratings with my class (a very fallible index) have increased steadily. Students appear to like being drawn into the pedagogy and respond just about as Belenky et al. (1986, see chapter 10) suggest students ought to, to the practice of connected or transformative teaching.

I have not yet begun the research that will attempt to assess the short- and long-term gains to be got from this kind of pedagogy, nor, as I noted earlier, have I had the opportunity yet to seriously address the relationship between theory and practice.

Notes

1. I do not have a statistical source to hand to support this assertion. I am drawing on my memory of Raymond Wlodkowski's summary of Martin Haberman's research, which he mentioned in the course of his address, in October 1987, to the Midwest Association for Teachers of Educational Psychology, Bowling Green, Ohio.

44/1

References

Barnes, D. (1976). From communication to curriculum. Middx., England: Penguin.

Belenky, M. F., Clinchy, B. M., Goldberger, N. R., & Tarule, J. M. (1986). Women's ways of knowing: The development of self, voice and mind. New York: Basic Books.

Britzman, D. P. (1986). Cultural myths in the making of a teacher: Biography and social structure in teacher education. Harvard Educational Review, 56, 442-456.

Clark, C. M. (1988). Asking the right questions about teacher preparation: Contributions of research on teacher thinking. Educational Researcher, 17, 5-12.

Connolly, R. (1981). Freire, praxis and education. In R. Mackie (Ed.), Literacy and revolution: The pedagogy of Paulo Freire. New York: Continuum.

Daloz, L. (1986). Effective teaching and mentoring: Realizing the transformational power of adult learning experiences. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1985). Valuing teachers: The making of a profession. Teachers College Record, 87, 205-218.

Darling-Hammond, L., & Wise, A. E. (1985). Beyond standardization: State standards and school improvement. The Elementary School Journal, 85, 317-336.

Elsasser, N., & John-Steiner, V. (1987). An interactionist approach to advancing literacy. In I. Shor (Ed.), Freire for the classroom: A sourcebook for liberatory teaching. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.

Fenstermacher, G., & Soltis, J. F. (1986). Approaches to teaching. New York: Teachers College Press.

Finkelstein, B. (1984). Education and the retreat from democracy in the United States, 1979-198? Teachers College Record, 86, 275-282.

Frankenstein, M. (1987). Critical mathematics education: An application of Paulo Freire's epistemology. In I. Shor (Ed.), Freire for the classroom: A sourcebook for liberatory teaching. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.

Freire, P. (1972). Pedagogy of the oppressed. Middx., England: Penguin Books.

Freire, P. (1985). The politics of education: Culture, power and liberation. Mass.: Bergin & Garvey Publishers.

Giroux, H. A., & McLaren, P. (1986). Teacher education and the politics of engagement: The case for a democratic schooling. Harvard Educational Review, 56, 216-238.

Goodlad, J. I. (1983a). A place called school: Prospects for the future. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Goodlad, J. I. (1983b). A study of schooling: Some findings and hypotheses. Phi Delta Kappan, 64, 465-470.

Goodman, J. (1984). Reflection and teacher education: A case study and theoretical analysis. Interchange, 15, 9-26.

Greene, M. (1988). The dialectic of freedom. New York: Teachers College Press.

Jackson, P. (1986). The practice of teaching. New York: Teachers College Press.

Kliebard, H. (1975). The question in teacher education. In D. J. McCarty (Ed.), New perspectives in teacher education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

McNeil, L. (1986). Contradictions of control: School structure and school knowledge. London: Methuen/Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Noddings, N. (1984). Caring: A feminine approach to ethics and moral education. Berkeley: University of California Press.

O'Loughlin, M. (1988a, August). Critical pedagogy: A necessary prerequisite for critical thinking in schools. Paper presented at the Eighth National and Sixth International Conference on Critical Thinking and Educational Reform, Center for Critical Thinking and Moral Critique, Sonoma State University, California.

O'Loughlin, M. (1988b, October). A problem-posing approach to pedagogy in teacher education. Paper presented at the Tenth Annual Conference on Curriculum Theory and Classroom Practice, Bergamo Conference Center, Dayton, Ohio.

O'Loughlin, M., & Campbell, M. (1988, February). Teacher preparation, teacher empowerment and reflective inquiry: A critical perspective. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, New Orleans, Louisiana.

Perry, W. G. (1970). Forms of intellectual and ethical development in the college years: A scheme. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Perry, W. G. (1981). Cognitive and ethical growth: The making of meaning. In A. Chickering and Associates, The modern American college. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Petrie, H. (1981). The dilemma of inquiry and learning. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Ravitch, D., & Finn, C. (1987). What do our 17-year-olds know? New York: Harper & Row.

Rogers, C. (1983). Freedom to learn for the 80s. Columbus, OH: Merrill.

Ryan, R. (1987). The care and feeding of the new teacher. Houghton Mifflin Educator's Forum, Fall issue.

Shor, I., & Freire, P. (1987). A pedagogy for liberation: Dialogues on transforming education. Mass.: Bergin & Garvey Publishers.

Shor, I. (Ed.). (1987). Freire for the classroom: A sourcebook for liberatory teaching. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.

Sirotnik, K. A. (1983). What you see is what you get - consistency, persistency and mediocrity in classrooms. Harvard Educational Review, 53, 16-31.

Sizer, T. (1984). Horace's compromise: The dilemma of the American high school. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

Skinner, B. F. (1968). The technology of teaching. New York: Appleton, Century, Crofts.

Skreslet, P. (1987, November 30). The prizes of first grade. Newsweek.

Stipek, D. (1988). Motivation to learn: From theory to practice. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Zeichner, K. M. (1983). Alternative paradigms of teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 34, May-June, 3-9.

44/1

FALL 1986

EDFI 302 Educational Psychology

Instructor: Michael O'Loughlin, 559 Education, 372-7336
Office Hours: 1:00-5:00 Monday, Wednesday, Friday

Text: Biehler, R.F., & Snowman, J. Psychology Applied to Teaching.

The course will have three components:

1. Mastery of Text and Lecture Material

Students will study the text in small units of one or two chapters, and will be tested following each unit. Groups will be formed at the first class meeting and students are encouraged to study and take practice tests cooperatively. Study guides will be made available prior to each test and students are encouraged to study feedback sheets following each test. Unit tests will lead to major exams at midterm and at the end of the semester.

2. Application of Text and Lecture Material

Following each unit students will be expected to write a reaction sheet (two typed pages maximum) responding to a set of questions that will be distributed. The purpose of this exercise is to give students an opportunity to integrate the material being mastered with their own understanding of teaching. This reaction sheet will be the product of group discussion, but each student must submit an individual sheet after each unit. Sheets will be returned with feedback comments and will be maintained in a folder by students. Students are expected to show increasing maturity in their efforts at application, over the semester, as determined by a final evaluation of the complete folder and oral presentations by students.

3. Clinical or Field Project

Choose one of the following options:

a. Tutoring - Hands-on teaching experience:

Through the Help-a-Child Project you will be able to tutor a child for two hours each week. You will prepare lessons according to a given format and submit reports weekly. You will also attend weekly tutor seminar sessions. (See attached information.)

b. Interviews and Observation - Reflections on the nature of Teaching:

Working in small groups students will engage in a field project designed to increase their understanding of the nature of teaching. This project will have three components:

(1) Interviews with three friends or colleagues to elicit their reflections on the outstanding teachers in their lives.

b. Interviews and Observation (continued)

2) Interviews with three teachers to elicit understanding of their perceptions of the teaching process.

3) Observation of these three teachers teaching a lesson of their choice.

Each group will compile a report, which is to be turned in along with original tapes of the interviews and notes from the classroom observation (detailed guidelines to be distributed later).

Grading Policy:

1. Cumulative test scores from unit tests, midterm and final, measuring mastery of course material: 50%.

2. Reaction sheets summarizing your understanding of what the course material means for you as a developing teacher (class participation and oral reports here also): 25%.

3. Project - Field Work.

Final report on participation in tutoring project, or final report from interview project: 25%.

Note: No more than 3 hours of class absence will be excused and only one test may be made up, irrespective of reason for absence.

EDFI Course Schedule Sec. 1211

	Text		Week Ending
Unit 1	Ch. 1	Introduction	8/29
Unit 2	Ch. 2	Stage Theories	9/5
	Ch. 3	Age Characteristics	9/12
Unit 3	Ch. 4	Assessing Variability	9/19
	Ch. 5	Dealing with Variability	9/26
Unit 4	Ch. 6	Objectives	10/3
		-Midterm-	10/10
Unit 5	Ch. 7	Behavioral Theories	10/17
	Ch. 8	Cognitive Theories	10/24
	Ch. 10	Information Processing	10/31
	Ch. 9	Humanistic Issues	11/7
Unit 6	Ch. 11	Motivation	11/14
	Ch. 13	Classroom Management	11/21
		-Thanksgiving-	
Unit 7		The Nature of Teaching Process	12/5*
		Student Reports and Preparation for Final	12/12
		-Final Exam-	12/17

(Note: There will be no test after Unit 1. All other unit tests will be given at the beginning of the session the week following the conclusion of the unit. Reaction sheets are also due on that date.)

*Interview Project Due

EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY
EDFI 302
Fall 1988

Michael O'Loughlin
559 Education Building
Phone: 372-7336
Office Hours: 2:00-2:30, Tuesday & Thursday
5:30-6:00, Thursday

Texts:

Barnes, D. (1975). From communication to curriculum. Middx., England: Penguin Books.

Stipek, D. J. (1988). Motivation to learn: From theory to practice. Englewood, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Fenstermacher, G. D. & Soltis, J. (1986). Approaches to teaching. New York: Teachers College Press.

Most other readings are in the course packet, available from Kinko's, 103 Railroad Street (354-3977). However, two articles are available only through Library Reserve.

Purpose:

The purpose of the course is to give you an opportunity to gain an understanding of the psychological issues that underlie teaching and learning, such as the nature of the child, the nature of teaching, the nature of learning, processes of motivation, and dealing with atypical learners. The focus of the course will be on having you reflect on and develop your own ideas about teaching so that you may be more reflective and effective in the classroom.

What you can expect of me:

My philosophy of teaching is that the course should be relevant and meaningful for you. If, at any time, you find that it is not meeting your needs or serving your interests, please do not hesitate to discuss this with me. I would like you to view this class as a growth or developmental experience for you. I would like to give you an opportunity to have your own understanding of yourself grow and develop over the period of the course. I will avoid lecturing, giving multiple choice tests, etc. because I am not convinced of the educational value of sitting in class absorbing information and regurgitating it on tests. If you did that, you would forget all you had "learned" once finals were over. Instead, I will provide opportunities for you to reflect, talk, discuss and react to the material you read, to the views of your colleagues, and even to your own thoughts. I will try to structure the evaluation system to reflect these values.

What I will expect of you:

I hold the highest expectations possible of all of my students. I make the assumption that if you signed up for this class and if you paid good money, that you want to be here. I expect that you want to learn, to grow, and to develop. Consequently, I expect that you will always be in class, that you will always have prepared for class, and that you will be willing to participate in the learning experience of the class. Since all of these are integral to the way I intend to teach the class, it will be extremely difficult for you to succeed in the class if you cannot meet these expectations. I would like you to have as your objective in the class to get as much as possible out of it for yourself. You may be concerned about grades (and I am too), but I don't want you to focus on your grade. Be assured that if you come in to the class with the idea of learning all you can, you will more than likely end up with a grade that reflects that attitude.

It is important that you feel that this is your class. I am here to facilitate your learning. Consequently, I will try to create a non-threatening, friendly atmosphere. Don't be afraid to jump in and express your views. It is only by doing so that you will learn. If at any time you feel lost in the class, feel frustrated by what's going on, feel that you aren't learning, etc., please feel free to discuss this with me. I am not here to try to exert power over you. Rather, my goal is to make this the most productive learning experience that I know how. Your feedback is essential to my success--and to your own! Let me know how you're doing!

35/19

EDFI 302 (6:00 - 9:00, Thursday)
Fall 1988
O'Loughlin

Assignments

In keeping with my values regarding learning I have developed a variety of assignments. The percentage of your grade to be allocated to each, and indeed whether those are the most appropriate assignments, is open to negotiation, and will be discussed in class.

1. Preparation for Class

In this class you will be expected to take responsibility for your own learning. You will not benefit from the class unless you have read and studied the material in advance. To demonstrate to me that you are preparing for class you will keep a work log or notebook in which you prepare working notes for class. These notes need not (and generally should not) be summaries of the material. Better that they take the form of questions, observations or reactions that occurred to you while reading the material and discussing it with study partners. You will also be expected to write a critical paragraph reacting to what you read, saying what you think of the point of view, saying what you did or didn't gain from the reading, etc. Entries in your work log should be dated. These logs will be inspected, and your level of participation in class discussion will also be noted.

2. Journal: "Reflections on Teaching"

You will keep a journal for the class. Guidelines on exactly how to do this are in the Fulwiler chapter which is on reserve in the library. We will also discuss it in class. The purpose of the journal is for you to keep a log of your thoughts on the issues we discuss so that you become reflective, and thus deepen your under standing of teaching and learning. Your journal will be handwritten but should be legible as I will read parts of it. Journal must be written in regularly with all entries headed with the date and time of entry. Your journal will also provide a workspace for regular reflection on your field experience.

3. Philosophy of Teaching

Toward the end of the semester, after reviewing your journal and field experience project notes, you will write a statement of your own philosophy of teaching. Guidelines will be distributed in class.
Recommended length: 4 pages, typed double-spaced.
Due date: November 24.

4. Synthesis Papers

To demonstrate your mastery of the material covered, you will write four brief synthesis papers. These brief papers are designed to test your mastery and understanding of the material. Since you will write the papers for different audiences, you will also gain experience writing in different voices. To help you polish your work, you will write each one in rough draft form to be reviewed by your peers (and by me, if you wish), and, then, in final draft.

Topic 1

"The nature of achievement motivation and how it might be fostered in school."
Length: 1-1½ pages.
Rough draft due: Thursday, September 29
Final draft due: Thursday, October 13
Audience: Parents

Topic 2

"Choosing an approach to teaching."
Length: 1-1½ pages.
Rough draft due: Thursday, October 20
Final draft due: Thursday, November 3
Audience: Instructor

Topic 3

"Teaching for transformation in a dialogical setting."
Length: 3 pages
Rough draft due: Thursday, November 10
Final draft due: Thursday, November 24
Audience: Instructor as colleague to be educated

Topic 4

"My approach to classroom discipline."
Length: 1-1½ pages
Rough draft due: Thursday, December 1
Final draft due: Thursday, December 8
Audience: Parents

7. Field Experience

Since this class carries 20 hours of credit toward teacher certification, all students are required to engage in a field experience project. To satisfy this requirement, you will enroll in Help-a-Child and tutor one or more students each week for the semester. This is required. If you absolutely cannot accommodate this in your schedule, see me.

My Expectations:

If you are to benefit from this type of course (and if you want to do well in it), it is essential that you read the materials prior to the class in which they will be discussed. Students who don't will disadvantage themselves greatly. I expect you to participate in whole-class and small-group discussions diligently. The bottom line is that you must attend class regularly. I try to be flexible but if you miss more than one class meeting without specific approval, you will have a percentage deducted from your final grade for each class beyond the second that you miss. (Deduction - 1% for each hour missed without approval.)

Evaluation System:

My goal is to provide a learning environment in which students can succeed. The less you have to worry about grades, and the more you focus on learning, the more successful you will be. Here is a suggested grading scheme, which is subject to your agreement:

(1)	Preparation for class (work log and class participation)		10%
(2)	Journal		15%
(3)	Philosophy of Education		15%
(4)	Synthesis Papers	Topic 1	8%
		Topic 2	8%
		Topic 3	16%
		Topic 4	8%
(5)	Field Experience		20%
		Total	100%

A = 91 - 100%
B = 81 - 90%
C = 71 - 80%
D = 70 or below

Notes:

(1) All papers except rough drafts must be typed and proofed and are due on date stated.

(2) I regret that I cannot give Incomplete as a class grade. Your final grade will be based on the total of work turned in.

35/26

EDFI 302 - EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY
Schedule - Fall 1988
(Thursday, 6:00)
Michael O'Loughlin

Week		
		I. OVERVIEW AND PROSPECTUS
1	Th 8/25	Introduction to course, requirements, expectations. Read Fulwiler chapter (Library Reserve) as soon as possible. Journal topic: Your philosophy of teaching and learning; your reaction to class plan.
		II. PHYSICAL AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT
		Lecture on physical development and its implications for social development. Video: Cipher in the snow, 8:15 Journal topic: React to film, and "Chubby boy" handout. [Begin reading Stipek book in preparation for next week.]
2	Th 9/1	Lecture on self-worth and school achievement, using Erikson's theory. Journal topic: 1) How was self-worth handled in the schools you attended? 2) React to "The integrity of the self" handout.
		III. MOTIVATION TO LEARN
		Open discussion on your own personal motivation. Answer the "motivation discussion questions" before class, and bring in your responses. Journal topic: Write a detailed analysis of your own personal motivation, now, and in high school.
3	Th 9/8	Introduction to motivation theory. Read Stipek, chapters 1 & 2 for today's class. Journal topic: React to "Life in Hell" cartoons.
		Reinforcement theory. Discussion of Stipek, Chapters 3 & 4 in class today. In class: Read and react to Paula Skreslet article. In journal, continue reaction to Skreslet, and "Cleveland As."

4	Th 9/15	The notion of intrinsic motivation. Read Stipek, chapters 5 & 6 for today's class. Journal topic: "Help-a-Child" analysis. More on self-worth and school achievement. Read Stipek, chapters 8 & 9 for today's class. Journal topic: Analysis of your perceptions of your ability, your anxiety level, and how these affect your performance.
5	Th 9/22	Developing positive achievement motivation. Read Stipek, chapter 9, for today's class. Discussion: Wrap-up of motivation. Journal topic: "I used to think...but now I think." Also, reflect on how you are reacting to the class, as we progress. Teacher expectations & self-fulfilling prophecies. Stipek, chapter 10, and supplementary lecture. Journal topic: An analysis of your Help-a-Child case from the perspective of motivation.
		IV. THE NATURE OF TEACHING AND LEARNING [Note: F & S = Fenstermacher & Soltis book]
6	Th 9/29	The Teacher as Executive: A behavioristic or mimetic approach to teaching. Read Jackson handout, F & S, Chapters 1 & 2, and case studies that accompany chapter 2 (p. 64-69 of F & S). Journal topic: Respond to a case study of your choice. React to "Efficient diploma mill." [Possible Ravitch video -- also, see my memorization paper in Kinko's packet.] The Teacher as Therapist: A humanistic approach to teaching. Read Roger's handout and F & S, chapter 3, and case studies that accompany chapter 3 (p. 70-74). Journal topic: Respond to case study of your choice.

7	Th 10/6	More on self-worth, school achievement and connected teaching. Video: Purkey's Invitational Learning, 6:00 Journal topic: React to Purkey video. Also analyze your Help-a-Child experience from a humanistic perspective. The Teacher as Liberator: A transformative approach to teaching. Reread Jackson handout, also F & S, chapter 4, and case studies that accompany chapter 4 (p. 75-80). Journal topic: Analyze your current and past experience with respect to the three modes of teaching.
		V. ANALYZING TRANSFORMATIVE IDEAS IN SCHOOL
8	Th 10/13	Learning as transformation. Barnes, chapter 1 (see reading guide in Kinko's packet). Journal topic: Argue against Barnes' view. Continue Barnes, chapters 2 & 3 (see reading guide). Journal topic: List as many applications of Barnes' ideas within your field as you possibly can (brainstorm!). [Note: Final draft of synthesis paper #1 due today.]
9	Th 10/20	Conclude Barnes, chapters 4 & 5 (see reading guide). Video: Teaching Children How to Think (6:45) Journal topic: I used to think learning was easy...but now I know..." Reflect on the different modes of learning we used in class. Which worked for you? Which didn't? Why? What would have been better? Wrap-up of learning -- introduction of connected teaching as a synthesizing concept. Read Belenky chapter very carefully (in Kinko's packet). Journal topic: Detailed reaction to Belenky chapter. React to "This trivial bottom-aching thing..."

10	Th 10/27	Meeting the challenge of teaching. Video: High Schools in America. 6:00 Journal topic: React to video. Begin piecing together your goals and philosophy of teaching. VI CLASSROOM PEDAGOGY -- SELECTED ISSUES [Note: All subsequent readings in Kinko's packet] Classroom discipline I: Focus on control. Based on corporal punishment and behavior modification for today's class. Journal topic: How were you disciplined at home and at school? How did this affect you in terms of later attitude to school, authority, etc.?
11	Th 11/3	Focus on control continues. Read about the Canter Model, as well as Gartrell's critique for today's class. Journal topic: React to the approaches to discipline that we have discussed thus far. Classroom discipline II: Focus on developing responsibility and self-discipline. Read about Bettelheim and Glasser approaches to "authoritative discipline" for today's class. Journal topic: I used to think discipline...but now I..." [Note: Final draft of synthesis paper #2 due today]
12	Th 11/10	More on Glasser. Film: Glasser's Reality Therapy (6:00) Journal topic: My philosophy of discipline. Focus on equality. Read Sleeter's "Success for all Students," for today's class. Journal topic: Reflection on your Help-a-Child experience.

13	Th 11/17	Focus on learning disability I: Read Balk's "Learned Helplessness" and "Risks of LD Label" for today's class. Journal topic: Labels! Focus on learning disability II: Read Brown et al. "Poor readers: Teach, don't label," on reserve in library, also Laurie Lee's anecdote. Journal topic: Use your imagination! [Note: Philosophy of teaching due before Thanksgiving.] [Note: Final draft of synthesis paper #3 due before Thanksgiving]
14	Th 11/24	Thanksgiving!
15	Th 12/1	Mainstreaming of handicapped students. Read text of PL 94-142 and "It's Okay to be Different." Video: Including me (6:30) Journal topic: Reaction to video.
	Th 12/1	Open forum on your Help-a-Child tutoring experience and its relationship to what we discussed in class. Journal topic: Final reflections on your Help-a-Child experience.
16	Th 12/8	Your choice...suggestions for topics and format invited! Journal: Final reflections on the class, what worked, what didn't, what you liked, disliked, etc. Wrap-up: The prospects for teachers. Video: Tribute to Teachers [Note: Final draft of synthesis paper #4 due today.]

35/27

EDFI 302 (Honors)
Spring 1988

Assignments

In keeping with our values regarding learning we have developed a variety of assignments. The percentage of your grade to be allocated to each, and indeed whether those are the most appropriate assignments, is open to negotiation, and will be discussed in class.

1. Preparation for Class

In this class you will be expected to take responsibility for your own learning. You will not benefit from the class unless you have read and studied the material in advance. To demonstrate to us that you are preparing for class you will keep a work log or notebook in which you prepare working notes for class. These notes need not (and generally should not) be summaries of the material. Better that they take the form of questions, observations or reactions that occurred to you while reading the material and discussing it with study partners. You will also be expected to write a critical reaction to what you read, saying what you think of the point of view, saying what you did or didn't gain from the reading, etc. Entries in your work log should be dated. These logs will be inspected, and your level of participation in class discussion will also be noted.

2. Journal: "Reflections of My Teaching"

You will keep a journal for the class. Guidelines on exactly how to do this are in the Fulwiler chapter which is on reserve in the library. We will also discuss it in class. The purpose of the journal is for you to keep a log of your thoughts on the issues we discuss so that you become reflective, and thus deepen your understanding of teaching and learning. Your journal will be handwritten but should be legible as we will read parts of it. Journal must be written in regularly with all entries headed with the date and time of entry. Your journal will also provide a workspace for regular reflection on your field experience.

3. Class Leadership Experience

There are three bundles of optional readings on the reading list. You, along with some other students, will team up to study one of these bundles and you will prepare a teaching experience of some sort, to help the other students in the class understand and appreciate the ideas. You will work on the preparation under our supervision and, individually or collectively, you will turn in a written "lesson plan" for our inspection.

4. Curriculum Exploration Experience

The last four class periods have been set aside for exploring applications of educational psychology concepts to classroom processes. You will work in teams of 4 or 5, under supervision, to research a topic which your group will then "teach" to the class. You may choose a topic of interest to you, but examples of appropriate topics might be the following:

Early childhood education
Teaching writing
Teaching reading
Teaching math
Creativity
Learning disability
Poverty and race (effects on achievement)
Mainstreaming of handicapped
Teaching science
Etc.

Selection of topics is contingent upon our expertise and interests of other class members. Supervision, suggestions for reading, etc. will be provided.

5. Philosophy of Teaching

At the end of the semester, after reviewing your journal and field experience project notes you will write a statement of your own philosophy of teaching. Guidelines will be distributed in class. Recommended length: 5 pages, typed double-spaced.

6. Concept Paper

You will write a brief concept paper on a topic of your choice related to the course objectives. Selection of a topic should be made within the first 4 weeks, and a rough draft must be ready by March 1. Copies of this draft will be distributed anonymously to two of your peers for evaluation. One of us will also review it. You will then rework it as needed, and present a final draft by the end of the semester. Topic, size, audience, requirements, etc. for this paper will be discussed in class.

7. Field Experience

Since this course carries 20 hours of field experience credit toward teacher certification, all participants are required to engage in a field experience project. You will have 3 options to choose from:

1) Working in Crim Elementary under the supervision of Jean or Joy.

Reading List - EDFI 302 (Honors)
Spring 1988

Required books:

Barnes, D. (1976). From communication to curriculum. London: Penguin Books.

Covington, M.V., & Beery, R. G. (1976). Self-worth and school learning. New York: Holt, Rinehart, Winston.

Petrie, H. G. (1981). The dilemma of enquiry and learning. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Jackson, P. W. (1986). The practice of teaching. New York: Teachers College Press.

Plato. (1949). Meno. Bobbs-Merrill Company.

Required Reading (in order in which we will use them):

Fulwiler, T. "Using a journal." (1987). In L. A. Bond & A. S. Magistrale (Eds.), Writer's guide: Psychology. Lexington,Mass.: D. C. Heath.

Belenky, M. F. et al. (1986). Women's ways of knowing. (Ch. 10, "Connected teaching). New York: Basic Books.

Newman, B. M. & Newman, P. R. (1987). (Extracts summarizing Erikson's theory). In Development through life: A psychosocial approach. Chicago: Dorsey Press.

Balk, D. (1983). Learned helplessness. Journal of School Health, 53, 365-370.

Drew, W. F. et al. (1976). "Case studies in motivation." From Motivating today's students. Palo Alto, CA: Learning Handbooks.

Good, T. L., & Brophy, J. E. (1986). "Teacher expectations." In Educational Psychology: A realistic approach. New York: Longman.

Skinner, B. F. (1968). "The etymology of teaching" (Ch. 1), and "The science of learning and the art of teaching" (Ch. 2). From The Technology of Teaching. New York: Appleton Century Crofts.

Bettelheim, B. (1987). Punishment versus discipline. In Annual Editions: Human Development. Dushkin Publishing Group.

Brown, A. L., & Palincsar, A. S. (1986). Poor readers: Teach, don't label. In U. Neisser (Ed.), The school achievement of minority children. N.J.: Erlbaum.

Optional Reading (Bundle #1): Motivation

Bandura, A. (1984). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. Psychological Review, 84, 191-195.

Dweck, C. S. (1986). Motivational processes affecting learning. American Psychologist, 41, 1040-1048.

Phillips, D. (1984). The illusion of incompetence among high-achieving children. Child Development, 55, 2000-2016.

Optional Reading (Bundle #2): Discipline

Baumrind, D. (1978). Parental disciplinary patterns and social competence in children. Youth and Society, 9, 239-276.

Bryan, J. W., & Freed, J. W. (1982). Corporal punishment: Normative data and sociological and psychological correlates in a community college population. Journal of youth and adolescence, 11, 77-87.

Charles, C. M. (1985). "The Neo-Skinnerian Model: Shaping desired behavior" (Ch. 2); The Glasser Model: Good behavior comes from good choices" (Ch. 4); "The Canter Model: Assertively taking charge" (Ch. 7). In Building classroom discipline: From models to practice. New York: Longman.

Optional Reading (Bundle #3): Failure and Learning Problems

Ogbu, J.. (1986). "The consequence of the American caste system" (Ch. 2). In U. Neisser (Ed.), The school achievement of minority children. N.J.: Erlbaum.

Heath, S. G. (1981). "Questioning at home and at school: A comparative study" (Ch. 4); F. Gearing & P. Epstein, "Learning to wait: An ethnographic probe into the operations of an item of hidden curriculum" (Ch. 8). In G. Spindler (Ed.), Doing ethnography: Educational anthropology in action. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

27/5